

**Utah Citizens Advisory Commission
on
Chemical Weapons Demilitarization
Thursday, May 16, 2002
6:30-8:30 p.m.
Utah Department of Environmental Quality
168 North 1950 West**

**THE TAPE WITH THE FOLLOWING MINUTES HAS BEEN PRESERVED WITH THE MINUTES IN
ORDER TO VERIFY THE QUESTION/ANSWER PERIOD.**

Members present:

Cherry Wong for Rosemary Holt Geoff Silcox
Dan Bauer
Gene White
Beverly White
David Ostler
Gary Griffith
Grey hair guy not at last 3 meetings

Members excused:

Rosemary Holt
Debbie Kim
Jane Boman
Dennis Downs
Sid Hullinger

1. Dan Bauer, who was Acting Chair because Ms. Kim was out for medical reasons, called welcome/Minutes- The meeting to order. The minutes from March 21, 2002 were approved as written. Motion made by Gene White, seconded by Geoff Silcox

2. Interpretation of Sub-Clinical levels of TWA & Cumulative affects over time was presented by Roger McIntosh, Consulting Medical Director at PMCD. Mr. McIntosh discussed chronic low-level exposures to nerve agents and how they affect the body. A handout was provided.

Q-Mark Mesesan, EG & G- When referencing "sub-clinical" are you talking about effects that are not outwardly observable?

A-The definition of sub-clinical is "no clinical signs, no depression in ChE, outside the normal variations of the test." Sub-toxic would be no clinical signs but measurable depression in ChE.

Q-60 Minutes did a report on the effects of chemical weapons, have we been able to ascertain any information because of that situation? It was indicated that in program that nerve agent was involved.

A-(*Very inaudible*) Most of the effects reported were those on the reproductive system, birth defects. Other comments about cross-linking DNA. (*Very inaudible*)

Q-Haven't we had 85 years of experience with mustard victims now?

A-Yes, but we keep re-inventing the methodologies we use to set standards, what was an acceptable mustard standard in 1975 in not an acceptable method for standard setting so the CDC and health departments are going back and looking at it and determining a new methodology. Eventually, I think, we will end up with a new set of mustard standards, but what the number will be, I do not know.

Q- What about 40-50 years ago when this was being made, how dangerous do you think it was then?

A-The inherent toxicity of the chemical has not changed, what have changed are the standards that the workers are provided. The danger was much higher back then when working with this chemical.

Dan Bauer-Dr. please stick around and we will address questions at the end of the presentations.

Q-Cindy King-what is the standard for VX?

A-What number would you like to know? The official number has not changed. The numbers have been put out for public comment

Q- When is the comment period?

A-The comment period ended last month. We do not have any final recommendations yet.

3. Risk Assessment -Christopher Bittner, Department of Environmental Quality-A handout was provided. An executive summary of the Risk Assessment was sent to all commissioners prior to this meeting for review, which is on file. A review of the assessment was conducted and the method part of the presentation was skipped due to time constraints

Q-What caused the contamination? What kind?

A-Plasticizers, use in rocket fuel, but not in the waste.

Comment-it was confirmed that everyone received the executive summary, if needs to be resent, the whole report is on the web site.

Q- When is the next public meeting?

A-Next Tuesday in Tooele

Dialogue between Chris Bittner and Cindy King asking the questions.

Q-Doesn't the experiment you did make several assumptions about the contents of the waste?

A-The waste has been characterized (interrupted)

Q- Is that all of the waste?

A-Continuous sampling will take place of the VX just like what has been done with GB. Some sampling has been done of the ton containers, some munitions because of safety reasons; you cannot cut in to sample those.

Q- What about the emissions from the stack? Not all the emissions have been analyzed, is that correct?

A-Yes

Q-So you are telling me that all of the dioxins have been analyzed?

A-The dioxins we don't have a mechanical method

Q- What about chlorinated?

A-For chlorinated, we don't have a method for, but the chemists have concluded that you would not see chlorinated ones because they are not favored during the combustive process.

Q-So all the chlorinated (*inaudible*) ones have not been analyzed

A-All the chlorinated dioxins have been.

Dialogue ends.

Q-Now that the VX campaign is beginning, if the proposals from the CDC became finalized and (*inaudible*) how will that affect the Risk Assessment?

A- The new values have been run as proposed and we would meet those

Q-Back to the experiment, if it is not detectable because we cannot see that low, what if the nondetect level is higher than what the general population exposure limit is considered acceptable?

A-I don't think that will happen.

Q-Can monitoring take place at the proposed levels?

A- We can monitor at the proposed levels. We can meet the general population levels everywhere at the facility.

5. Tooele County Emergency Management Plan -Kari Sagers. A handout was provided. The topics that were discussed were Planning, Preparedness and Response Partnership, Protective Actions with Shelter in Place and Evacuation. This is part of the statewide Utah Communications Agency Network. Also discussed was the plume information and planning. A handout was provided that discussed further in depth the protective action recommendations put together by Michael Myirski and John Sorenson and the CSEPP Shelter-In-Place work group. The Emergency Management team is trained to deal with the worst case scenarios.

Q-If you are here, who is in manning the emergency station right now?

A-24 hour coverage from the dispatch center provides coverage. The Sheriff can make decisions and myself and staff all has pagers, commissioners have pagers.

Q-How do you keep staff focused when nothing has happened for a long time, but need to be prepared that it might?

A-We experience things like 9/11 that keeps us aware that anything can happen. We take all calls seriously; have constant dialogue with DCD, constant exercises and scenarios.

Q-Tom Goldsmith-Please clarify the plume and the containment

A-Take the characteristics of the agent, look at the meteorological conditions, how it was released, then combine with the weather conditions, there are a lot of factors. It is computer generated modeling that plugs in all of the characteristics and the conditions.

Comment: VX is much heavier than GB that some of the modeling that is done, the VX is so heavy it just won't go anywhere.

Q-Jason Groenwald-With new toxicity levels that are being proposed, dispersion modeling the area expands, have more people been consulted in the immediate response zone are more kits being handed out? How is that process being conducted?

A- We have been looking at that from the start. There will be a technical team that will come and see if there are other adjustments that need to be made, but for the most part, we are in an isolated area, so it does not have as great an impact on us. Definitely the toxicity levels with the AEGLs, it takes in exposure times etc. there are some impacts, but for specific circumstances, not as many as you think. We have not adjusted the immediate response zone to be further distances at this time, look at the whole picture concerning VX. There are many factors; it is not a linear issue. The properties of the agent have changed.

Any more discussion about this topic, please do so after the meeting, for the sake of time.

6. Report of Task Force Initiative on Waste Neutralization-Dr. Michael Keene, State Science Advisor. This report was postponed to for next meeting, due to lack of time and future visit to Aberdeen Proving Grounds in June. Cindy King is attending the meeting in Aberdeen as well; include her in the report at next meeting.

3. Chemical Surety Inspection-Col. Peter Cooper-A handout was provided with all discussed information.

8. Program Status-Dale Ormond-Covering the status of the other facilities, a handout was provided with this information in detail. The Anniston facility is starting some trial burns, begin operations in September.

9. Plant Status -Tom Kurkij.

- a. Follow up on Action Level 3 incident from 1/30/02-specifically level of PPE worn by workers and AchE levels.

A hand out was provided with all details of presentation.

Preparations are being made for the PMCD pre-op starting June 4. Progress is being made. Mid to late June is the scheduled start up, dictated by the trial burn. Rockets will be first munitions that will be processed. Regarding incident on January 30 followed up regarding the ChE testing by Dr. Gary Matravers.

Q-Was the ton container cradle the appropriate equipment for movement of the ton containers?

A-Yes, the ton container cradle is the container specified by the Army to put a leaking "projo" in. Helium leak tested before use.

Q-Just with plastic?

A-No, it is an approved overpack container for projos by the Army. They are helium leak tested before given to TOCDF for use.

Q- For clarification, "projo" is an artillery round?

A-Yes.

Questions of follow-up items

Q-What do you define as an ONC? Is this ton container cradle an ONC?

A-No. ONC is the on-site container that is used to transport the munitions from the igloos to the truck. Ton container cradles do not ever go into the ONC's. Once the ONC is in the unpack, we've monitored it and opened it up, we then load the ton containers into the cradle, picked up with a forklift and put into the conveyor and processed into the ECB and toxic area into the munitions processing bay where they punched, drained and then moved to the metal parts furnace for processing.

Q- This is in reference to the ton container cradle?

A-Correct, ton container cradles do not go into the ONC's

Q-What about the M-16, at what point are you loading those into the cradle?

A-They come in on a palette, then transferred into a ton container cradle in the unpack area.

Q-Why don't they come in on an ONC?

A-They can come in on an ONC or a van according to our permit. We have several overpacks specified in our SOP, as an oversight, we did not have the M-16 listed in the SOP, however, it was within our permit to bring the M-16's in either an ONC or an enclosed van.

Q-Is there any discussion to bring the projectiles into the facility in an ONC instead of on a palette? To make the standard?

A-One of the corrective actions to be evaluated by PMCD is to evaluate the transportation aspects of overpacks. The permit we have with the State of Utah allows us to transport the

overpacks in a van or an ONC, a van was chosen to do this. The essence of the issue is transporting in the ONC or the van had nothing to do with the incident that occurred. The overpacks with the "projos" in it were removed from the van, taken upstairs into the unpack area while they were on the pallets and from the pallets they were moved by hand into the ton container cradles and it was when the forklift driver picked up the ton container cradle and was moving it to put it onto the conveyor belt when the M-16 fell off. Whether it came in by ONC or van is really immaterial to the incident that happened, because if they came in on an ONC, they still would have come in on a palette, the palette would have gone through the same series of processes, the M-16's would have been loaded into the ton container cradle just like it had been.

Q-How long does the DAAMS tube normally sample before its regenerated?

A-It depends on the area it is monitoring. We change the DAAMS tubes on the stack every 4 hours; in CAT C area we change them every 8 hours.

Jason-The letter that was distributed to the council is in regards to the worker that raised some concerns, the one that received all the press. I received this by email, that is why it is not signed. I appreciate the effort into the presentations to cover the meetings. My concern is about the schedule and meeting every other month, second or third meeting in a row and it may be worth looking at meeting every again to cover issues that are not being addresses, maybe not every month, but 9 out of 12 months in the year. A lot of questions and clarifications that we cannot get to because of the time constraints. The new toxicity standards really need to be addressed. Generally, we could meet more than every other month.

Agenda item would be the impact of FEMA announcing they are pulling out? What is going on with that? What are the potential impacts?

Kari Sagers-What is being discussed is that FEMA is in the response business and should not be in long term programs, but from what is understood, that was a "shoot from the hip" comment and that there are a lot of other implications that have not been considered, one proposal that was thrown out, again, this is a lot of rumor, Army may give block grants to communities, with discussions going on, there will be a lot of negotiations.

Agenda item-I will get as much info as possible for next meeting regarding FEMA

Jason-Suggest a meeting in June, at the last meeting we talked about the status of Indiana, waiting on some funding, there was an article that came out, some funding was secured and anticipate being able to finish the program by 2004, possibly by end of 2003, much further ahead of schedule.

Discussion of a June meeting will be conducted via email between the commissioners.

Cindy King-I have a concern that this is to scheduled as the requirements for the public participation on the risk assessment, I would like to have the commission look into have joint meetings with the SHW. Several questions were left unanswered regarding the risk assessment.

Mark Mesesan-My concern is with perspective, when I had a question about the detection levels, I talked to a lab manager and explained the detection levels would be like finding one drop in 256 Olympic size swimming pools is the detection level we have for finding GB. This gives a type of demonstration in how low the detection level is.

Meeting adjourned at 9: 15 p.m.